



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
06/472,559	03/07/83	CHECK F	E-812

PETER VRAHOTES  
C/O PITNEY BOWES INC.,  
WALTER H. WHEELER, JR. DRIVE  
STAMFORD, CT 06904

EXAMINER	
MILLER, G	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
216	4

DATE MAILED: 11/29/83

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☐ This application has been examined ☒ Responsive to communication filed on Sept. 26, 1983 ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s),        days from the date of this letter.  
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.                  |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449                  | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152 |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474      | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____   |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 11-14, 16, 20 and 21 are pending in the application.  
Of the above, claims \_\_\_\_\_ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 11-14, 16, 20 and 21 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes until such time as allowable subject matter is indicated.
8. ☐ Allowable subject matter having been indicated, formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on \_\_\_\_\_. These drawings are ☐ acceptable;  
☐ not acceptable (see explanation).
10. ☐ The ☐ proposed drawing correction and/or the ☐ proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on \_\_\_\_\_  
has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner. ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed \_\_\_\_\_, has been ☐ approved. ☐ disapproved (see explanation). However,  
the Patent and Trademark Office no longer makes drawing changes. It is now applicant's responsibility to ensure that the drawings are  
corrected. Corrections MUST be effected in accordance with the instructions set forth on the attached letter "INFORMATION ON HOW TO  
EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES", PTO-1474.
12. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received  
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. \_\_\_\_\_; filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in  
accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 11-14, 16, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Yamada et al or Tsuzuki et al.

3. The McCollough et al and Hutt et al references are enclosed as additional examples of pertinent art.

4. Applicant's arguments filed September 26, 1983 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 5, 6, 8 11-14, 16, 20 and 21 have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Miller/dc

703/557/2911

11/23/83

*George H. Miller Jr.*

GEORGE H. MILLER, JR.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 216

44